

Appendix 4: Quality assessment

			Testing procedures	Selection	Interpretation of findings					
Author, Year	Context	HTC strategy	Clear description of HTC algorithms and validation of results Maximum score=2	Good representativeness of the sample Maximum score=2	Clear description of HTC outcome data Maximum score=2	Major limitations discussed Maximum score=2	Important sub-group analyses performed (i.e. HTC data stratified by age-group and sex) Maximum score=2	Total score	Overall quality: High: Total score= 8-10; Moderate: Total score= 5-7; Low: Total score= 0-4	Main comments
Ferrand (2010) ²¹	Inpatient	PITC	2	1	1	2	0	6	Moderate	Recruitment conducted on weekdays only
Wanyenze (2010) ¹⁸	Inpatient	PITC	1	1	1	1	1	5	Moderate	Analysed routine hospital records with moderate levels of missing data
Abbas (2010) ²⁷	Inpatient	PITC	1	0.5	1	0	0	2.5	Low	Consecutive sample drawn. Limitations not discussed. Testing procedures, participant flow and handling of known HIV-positives in the analysis are unclear
Kankasa (2009) ²⁸	Inpatient	PITC	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	4	Low	Consecutive sample drawn. Limitations of the study design and methods not sufficiently discussed. HTC outcome data not disaggregated by age

Ramirez-Avila (2012) ²⁵	Outpatient	PITC	2	0.5	2	1	0.5	6	Moderate	Analysed routine records from a semi-private facility, hence data may not be generalisable to public sector clinics. Missing data not described.
Kranzer (2014) ³¹	Outpatient	PITC	2	1.5	1	1	1	6.5	Moderate	High proportion of missing data for children who refused HTC
Ferrand (2010) ²²	Outpatient	PITC (n=506), ANC (n=88)	2	1	1	1	1	6	Moderate	Consecutive sample drawn. HTC outcome data not stratified by age
Mongare (2013) ¹⁵	Outpatient	Family-centred HTC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Abstract- quality assessment not done
Kulzer (2012) ¹⁶	Outpatient	Family-centred HTC	2	0.5	1	1	0	4.5	Low	Routine facility records used. Baseline data of sample and proportion of missing data not provided
Were (2006) ¹⁷	Home-based	Family-centred HTC	2	0.5	1	0	1	4.5	Low	Consecutive sample drawn. Limitations not discussed
Lugada (2010) ¹⁹	Home-based	Family-centred HTC	2	1	1	1	1	6	Moderate	Sub-study of a cluster-randomised trial. Households visited at specific times. HTC outcome data-Adolescents grouped with younger adults
Lugada (2010) ¹⁹	Outpatients	Family-centred HTC	2	1	1	1	1	6	Moderate	Sub-study of a cluster-randomised trial. Households visited at specific times. Adolescents grouped with younger adults

Naik (2012) ²⁴	Testing campaign	Home-based HTC	2	2	1	1	1	7	Moderate	HTC outcome data-Adolescents grouped with younger adults
Wachira (2014) ²⁹	Testing campaign	Home-based HTC	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	3	Low	Consecutive sample drawn. Retrospective record review of routine records. HTC outcome data not disaggregated by age
Vreeman (2010) ¹³	Testing campaign	Home-based HTC	2	0.5	2	1	0.5	6	Moderate	HTC was not universally offered to children in the household (eligibility for HTC was based on characteristics of the mother)
Dalal (2013) ¹⁴	Sero-prevalence survey	Home-based HTC	2	0.5	2	1	1	6.5	Moderate	Sampling strategy is unknown. Study is nested within a surveillance programme
Angotti (2009) ²⁶	Sero-prevalence survey	Home-based HTC	1.5	1	1	1	0.5	5	Moderate	HTC outcome data not stratified by age
Kranzer (2011) ⁸	Sero-prevalence survey	Outreach (Mobile clinic with home-based invitation)	2	1	1	1	0.5	5.5	Moderate	HTC outcome data not stratified by age
Baisley (2012) ⁹	Sero-prevalence survey	Outreach HTC at central site (opt out)	2	1	1	1	0.5	5.5	Moderate	HTC outcome data-Adolescents grouped with younger adults
Baisley (2012) ⁹	Sero-prevalence survey	Outreach HTC at central site (opt in)	2	1	1	1	0.5	5.5	Moderate	HTC outcome data-Adolescents grouped with younger adults

Isingo (2012) ¹⁰	Sero- prevalence survey	Outreach HTC at a central site	2	2	1	1	0.5	6.5	Moderate	HTC outcome data-Adolescents grouped with younger adults and data not stratified by age
Chamie (2014) ¹¹	Testing campaign	Outreach HTC	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	3.5	Low	HTC performed mainly on weekdays, with lower uptake among younger individuals. Individuals not at home were counted as eligible. HTC outcome data not disaggregated by age
Bandason (2013) ²³	Schools and community centres	School- linked HTC	2	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	4.5	Low	Consecutive sample drawn, HTC performed at select times during the day. HTC outcome data not stratified by age